1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION, 3 Plaintiff, 4 5 18 Civ. 1210 (VB) v. 6 CONFERENCE 7 LINDSAY RAE MCINTYRE, 8 Defendant. 9 United States Courthouse 10 White Plains, N.Y. February 12, 2018 11 12 13 Before: THE HONORABLE VINCENT L. BRICCETTI, District Judge 14 15 16 **APPEARANCES** 17 PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON, LLP Attorneys for Plaintiff 18 ROBERT A. ATKINS PIETRO SIGNORACCI 19 LIZA M. VELAZQUEZ MOZIANIO (TREY) S. RELIFORD 20 21 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP Attorneys for Defendant 22 MICHAEL DELIKAT JAMES H. McQUADE 23 24 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOUKIUS, LLP Attorneys for Defendant 25 SARAH E. BOUCHARD

1	THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of International
2	Business Machines Corporation against Lindsay Rae McIntyre.
3	Will counsel please note their appearance for the
4	record.
5	MR. ATKINS: Your Honor, Robert Atkins from Paul,
6	Weiss, representing the plaintiff, IBM.
7	THE COURT: Just identify your co-counsel for the
8	record.
9	MR. ATKINS: I will.
10	My partner, Liza Velazquez; my colleague, Pietro
11	Signoracci; and my colleague, Trey Reliford.
12	THE COURT: Good morning. Or good afternoon,
13	everybody.
14	MR. DELIKAT: And for Lindsay Rae McIntyre, Mike
15	Delikat, Orrick, Herringon & Sutcliffe. With me is my partner,
16	James McQuade. And with us, also, who hopefully will ECF file
17	her application pro hac vice, is Sarah Bouchard from the
18	Morgan, Lewis firm.
19	THE COURT: Welcome to all of you.
20	And is your client here as well? That's this lady in
21	the back here?
22	MR. DELIKAT: Yes, yes.
23	THE COURT: That's Ms. McIntyre?
24	MR. DELIKAT: That's Ms. McIntyre.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Have a seat, everybody.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Well, I've just had a conference with the lawyers in my chambers about how to proceed in this case, and I just want to quickly summarize where we are on the record.

I am going to sign the proposed order to show cause, including a TRO, with a slight modification which I'll describe in one second.

Having reviewed the papers submitted in support of the application as well as defense counsel's opposition, I think that a TRO, under these circumstances, is appropriate. After all, the defendant, Ms. McIntyre, the former employee of IBM, did sign a noncompete agreement, and it says that she can't work in a job that's in competition with her job at IBM, and there's certainly some reason to believe that the job that she's about to take or wants to take with Microsoft is essentially the same job as the job that she had at IBM, and so arguably it is a breach of the agreement to do that. Plus, there's no doubt in my mind that there is at least some sensitive and confidential information that she possesses and that, even if she stipulates, as she has pursuant to the agreement itself, that she will not disclose any such information, there is a risk that, because she's taking essentially the same job at Microsoft, there's a risk of disclosure of this confidential information, whether or not it's intentional, and even if it's not intentional.

So I think that there is a basis for a finding, at

least for now, anyway, both that there's a likelihood of success on the merits and that there is a likelihood of irreparable harm if not temporarily enjoined.

As far as irreparable harm is concerned, we start with the fact that the defendant, Ms. McIntyre, has agreed in writing that disclosure of confidential information to a competitor -- Microsoft is certainly a competitor -- would cause irreparable injury and that an injunction is the appropriate remedy.

Now, this is not conclusive. I said that to the lawyers in my chambers earlier. Every case turns on its own facts. But that is a fact. That's one of the facts that are relevant here, that is relevant here; namely, that she signed an agreement in which she stipulated or she agreed that if she takes a job like this, that it would create irreparable harm for which an injunction is appropriate.

Also, in this area, generally speaking, if IBM were able to prove at a preliminary injunction hearing both that she is in possession of highly confidential trade secret information and that there is a risk of disclosure, it seems to me that, in these kinds of cases, injunctions are appropriate, again, at least a temporary injunction, because it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for IBM to obtain some sort of money damages remedy. It's just the disclosure and the impact on IBM would be too subtle and too nuanced to be able to

really quantify in damages.

So, anyway, the point is that I am going to go ahead and sign this. However, I'm making one addition to the order, which was suggested by counsel. There was discussion back and forth about this, but, in any event, I've agreed to add the following clause. This is on the bottom of page 2, the paragraph starting with the word "ordered" in clause one. It says "working at or providing any services for Microsoft," and I'm adding the following: "Provided, however, that

Ms. McIntyre may be placed on the payroll of Microsoft for payroll and benefits purposes only." In other words, she can't work at Microsoft, but she can be paid by Microsoft while this matter is pending, at least while the TRO is pending. And I'm advised by counsel for Ms. McIntyre that Microsoft will pay her during this period, which I think is a good thing.

So it now reads: "Ordered that defendant Lindsay Rae McIntyre is temporarily enjoined and restrained until the hearing and determination of plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction from, one, working at or providing any services for Microsoft, provided, however, that Ms. McIntyre may be placed on the payroll of Microsoft for payroll and benefits purposes only." And then the rest of that paragraph remains the same, that it also prohibits Ms. McIntyre from soliciting any customer of IBM with which Ms. McIntyre was involved as part of her job responsibilities at IBM during the

last year of employment at IBM. It also prohibits her from contacting any current employees of IBM for the purpose of influencing them to leave IBM. And, finally, it prevents her from retaining, using or disclosing IBM confidential or proprietary information.

Now, I have strongly encouraged the parties to settle this case on terms that are acceptable to both sides. Probably not terms that each side would prefer, but any good settlement requires a comprise. It requires a certain amount of unhappiness on both sides. And I certainly have strongly urged counsel to try and find that comprise that works for both sides.

I've been advised by counsel directly that they will negotiate in good faith in an effort to find a middle ground here that is acceptable to both sides and a settlement to both sides, which, at the end of the day, would allow Ms. McIntyre to join Microsoft for all purposes; not just for payroll purposes, but to actually work there. The details of that, of course, remain to be negotiated. I am strongly urging and I am also hopeful that counsel will be able to accomplish that.

In order to facilitate that or to encourage that kind of discussion in the short term and cognizant of the fact that this TRO presumes, I guess, that Microsoft is going to be paying Ms. McIntyre, but not actually receiving any work from Ms. McIntyre in the short term, I think we need to move this

forward quickly as a matter of fairness to everybody.

For what it's worth, Ms. McIntyre, it's not a bad result for you in the sense that I don't know what your personal circumstances are, but my guess is that you would like to be working and like to be paid for working. And you're going to be paid, at least in the short term, so that's a good thing for you.

But everybody is ordered to be back here in this courtroom on February 22nd, which is a Thursday, I think Thursday of next week, at 12 noon. The only reason why you wouldn't be back here by then is if you filed a stipulation of dismissal or discontinuance prior to that time and date, but anything short of that, even if you are close to settling -- well, anything short of a stipulation of discontinuance being filed prior to noon on February 22nd means that you have to be here on that day and at that time.

In the meantime, there's a stay of all discovery. So there will be no discovery conducted between now and February 22nd. If the case is not settled then, on February 22nd, we'll talk further about where the case is going, including discovery or anything else that relates to the management of this case, or the preparation of this case, for a preliminary injunction hearing. And I've scheduled a preliminary injunction hearing to commence on March 12th, 2018 at 11 a.m. I've been advised by counsel that — now I don't remember.

1 Did you say three days or four days? How long did 2 you think this would take, Mr. Atkins, if we have it? Which I'm hoping we won't have it, but if we do. 3 4 MR. ATKINS: Three days. 5 THE COURT: Do you agree with that? 6 MR. DELIKAT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: All right. 8 So I advised counsel that I have a very busy trial 9 schedule coming up. For what it's worth, I have approximately 10 300 pending civil cases. This is one of them. And all of the 11 people involved in those other cases expect me to pay attention 12 to their cases, as well, so I'm doing the best I can in those 13 circumstances. If I didn't have other cases, I could devote 14 full attention to this case, but I do have other cases. And 15 that, by the way, doesn't even include criminal cases, of which 16 I have about 50. 17 All right. So I'm going to have this order to show 18 cause docketed. Is there anything else we need to do today, 19 20 Mr. Atkins? 21 MR. ATKINS: No, your Honor. Thank you. 22 THE COURT: Mr. Delikat? 23 MR. DELIKAT: No, your Honor. 24 THE COURT: All right. 25 I appreciate everyone being here. And have a good

day. And I was going to say I'll see you on the 22nd, but, actually, I hope I won't see you on the 22nd. I'm not being mean to anybody, but that would mean that, of course, the case got settled by then, so that's what I'm hoping will happen.

Have a good day.

- - - -